

~~SECRET~~

14 SEP 1961

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

CS/O/DCI

SUBJECT:

A Central Requirements Registry in CIA

REFERENCES:

- a. CRAG 3/2-61
- b. CRAG 3/1-61

1. As we had not received a copy of CRAG 3/2, "A Central Requirements Registry in CIA", [REDACTED] was good enough to provide a copy. I have now read this and have also reviewed Reference b., CRAG 3/1 "A Proposed Central Requirements Facility in CIA."

25X1

2. I feel that Mr. Borel has made tremendous strides towards meeting JSG recommendation number 22 but I am worried about what appears to be a reluctance to tackle the community problem at an early stage. I firmly believe that until a frontal attack is made on recommendation number 23 and unless an early effort is made to include DIA and the other services in the OCR central facility, we may not only lose valuable time but establish practices which may not be universally acceptable and will then become issues interfering with eventual, community-wide coordination.

3. Referring specifically to CRAG 3/2 the following thoughts occur to me.

Re para 2, first sentence. Would the Services really be reluctant to present us with copies of their internal or "departmental" requirements? This brings me to a point I have noted in connection with paragraph 7 which describes the three-step operation. I had thought that one of the first and essential steps would be for anyone who is to write a requirement (presumably initially this could only be enforced within CIA) to check the Registry to see if someone else had already written a requirement on this subject. The point here being that if OSI sets out to write a requirement on ASW, for instance, but finds through the Registry that the Navy has an internal one it would then be incumbent on OSI to coordinate its effort with the Navy. I believe that this feature would persuade the Services of the advisability of filing their requirements with us, although in the initial stages their system would not be integrated with ours. In other words, we could set the example of voluntary coordination.

Re para 2, last sentence. I feel that the consultative service is fine up to a point but when it comes to judging the "gross assets available for collection" I believe this should be the responsibility of the high-level group which for lack of any other name I dubbed "Requirements Control Committee" (RCC) in my 19 April memorandum to you. It is only this RCC which will have adequate clearances to do a thorough job. I think the OCR facility must serve as a communication link and a consultative service on many requirements problems but I would hate to see it get involved over its head.

Re para 5, sentence at bottom of page starting "In addition to a chronology ....." I thoroughly agree that OCR should record the fate of any requirement but I am not persuaded as to the need for recording the actions taken by the originator and the requirements officer. I would hope that one day this register will be set up to keep track of all requirements and when this comes about I feel that some of those being handled by the more sensitive collectors should have the minimum of detail recorded in a central registry. Sensitive collectors would probably be perfectly willing to have any requirement identified and subsequently have a record made of action completed but I doubt that they will be happy to accept any regulations requiring them to give a detailed accounting of how they tried to go about their task. Here again, this should be a matter for investigation by the RCC.

Re para 6, second sentence. I am afraid that this would be interpreted as an excessive demand for evaluations and will therefore be bucked by consumers. I know that the JSC report decried the paucity of evaluations but I do not believe that a bureaucratic requirement aimed at feeding a Central Registry is the proper way to attack this problem. Strongly as I support the need for this registry so do I also counsel against its becoming "busy".

3. As I have indicated before and stated rather hastily and in too great length in my 19 April memorandum, I am apprehensive of the piecemeal approach. After looking again at recommendation number 23 I carefully reread certain portions of the JSC report, which I have extracted and forward to you as an attachment to this memorandum. I believe that if you will reread these abstracts you will agree with me that the very real need for a top-level RCC is more eloquently and urgently propounded in the text than is summarized in the recommendation. As you know I have had some experience on

**SECRET**

committees addressing themselves to a close correlation between requirements or needs and collection resources, including a vicarious knowledge of CCPC. Based on this experience I am absolutely persuaded that an RCC can be formed and made to work if it addresses itself to the broad objectives stated in my extracts or more specifically spelled out in my 19 April memorandum. It will only be through forming such a committee and putting it in motion that it will be possible to identify the exact extent of those mechanical and working level correlating and coordinating functions which must inevitably be left to the OCR facility. In other words, only after RCC has been established and has identified what it intends to do and what support it needs, can the OCR facility become effectively active.

25X11A

  
Chief, Collection Staff, O/SI

Attachment:  
a/s

ATTACHMENT

"The USIB as an important part of its responsibility for managing the national intelligence effort is charged with the establishment of appropriate intelligence objectives, requirements and priorities." "... PNIOs" .... "guide for the coordination of intelligence collection and production," ..... "It is clear that the PNIOs are not intended to replace or exclude broad regular coverage of the world. Indeed, the PNIOs would be ineffective without such background."

NSCID No. 1 directs that USIB shall "Ensure that the pertinence, extent and quality of the available foreign intelligence and intelligence information relating to the national security is continually reviewed as a basis for improving the quality of intelligence and the correction of deficiencies." EIC, SIC, etc. (incl. CCPC) cited as good examples.

"Requirements in general are not sufficiently tailored to collection assets or resources..... An urgent need in the intelligence community today is a much closer correlation between requirements or needs and collection resources."

"The Joint Study Group believes that the described individual efforts of the members of the intelligence community to handle their own requirements and evaluations are inadequate to properly coordinate the collection activities of the community, and that the USIB must, as a part of its management responsibility, require that coordination be done on a community-wide basis, both at the Washington level and in the field.

"At the Washington level, we believe that there should be a central body for reviewing requirements, manned by top quality experts from the intelligence community representing all the agencies which either produce intelligence reports or collect intelligence information. This would in effect become a central clearing house for the most effective tying together of all requests for information with all resources for collecting that information ....."

"In order to ensure that the center be kept apprised of new assets and be informed about every form of collection resources, it should be manned by high-level experienced and fully cleared professionals from each agency. These professionals should be thoroughly acquainted with all of the collection resources of their respective organizations to assure that their requirements are not unnecessarily directed to other agencies."

SECRET